Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-10 are presented herewith for consideration.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,028,072 B1 (*Kliger*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,197 (*Chen*); Muller's <u>Desktop Encyclopedia of the Internet</u> (*Muller*) and Gralla's <u>How the Internet Works</u> (*Gralla*).

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kliger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,832,459 (*Cameron*); *Muller* and *Gralla*.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kliger* in view of *Chen*; *Muller* and *Gralla*.

In rejecting claims 1-10, the Examiner has not identified with specificity where the claimed elements are disclosed in *Kliger*, *Chen*, *Muller* and *Gralla*. Claim 1 includes at least 11 steps/elements; yet, the Examiner appears to identify only two elements that are disclosed by the cited art:

> Kliger discloses the claimed invention including: transferring from a user processing device (the user's computer which is e.g. a desktop computer which is connected to the internet and displaying web page **200**) a user identification value (identifier stored on the user's computer, C2, 3rd paragraph); Kliger does not directly disclose purchasing at at [sic] merchant web site (i.e. selecting the merchant link.) Chen teaches the how a user shop at at [sic]mechant web site just as they normally would. Office Action, page 3.

Accordingly, the Examiner has merely identified the first element of claim 1 ("transferring, from ..., a user identification value") and appears to state that the remaining steps/elements (**10 other elements**) are disclosed by Chen without citing a specific Figure, reference numeral and/or specification passage. The Examiner has not met the burden of showing each step/element that is disclosed by the cited art.

In particular, claim 1 calls for "converting the user identification value to a promotional value..." which is not disclosed or suggested by *Chen*.

Further, claim 1 calls for "adding the promotional information, by the associate processing device, to the purchase information responsive to the user identification value" which is not disclosed or suggested by *Chen*.

- 7 -

Further, the Examiner has not identified how the dependent claims 2-10 are disclosed by the cited art.

Claim 4 calls for "the promotional information includes a key value associated with the first merchant" which has not been identified in the cited art by the Examiner.

Claim 5 calls for "the user identification value is a card number" which has not been identified in the cited art by the Examiner.

Claim 7 calls for "obtaining, by a user, a card having the user identification value and a pass code value associated with a purchased product package; and, transferring, from the user processing device to the associate processing device, the pass code value" which has not been identified in the cited art by the Examiner.

Claim 8 calls for "providing a list of merchant links responsive to the user identification value and pass code value" which has not been identified in the cited art by the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kliger* in view of *Chen*; *Muller* and *Gralla* be withdrawn.

II.   Examiner's Assertions regarding Claim Interpretation

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kliger* in view of *Cameron*, *Muller* and *Gralla*.

As with the rejection above based on *Kliger*, *Chen*, *Muller* and *Gralla*, the Examiner has not identified with specificity where the claimed elements are disclosed in *Kliger*, *Cameron*, *Muller* and *Grall*. Claim 1 includes at least 11 steps/elements; yet, the Examiner appears to identify only two elements that are disclosed by *Kliger* and *Cameron*. The Examiner appears to state that at least 10 steps/elements (after the "transferring...a user identification value") are disclosed by *Cameron* without citing a specific Figure, reference numeral and/or specification passage.

Claim 1 calls for "converting the user identification value to a promotional value..." which is not disclosed or suggested by *Cameron*.

Further, claim 1 calls for "adding the promotional information, by the associate processing device, to the purchase information responsive to the user identification value" which is not disclosed or suggested by *Cameron*.

Also, as in above, the Examiner has not identified where *Cameron* discloses the limitations of claims 4, 5, 7 and 8.

- 8 -

Therefore, it is respectfully requested the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kliger* in view of *Cameron*, *Muller* and *Gralla* be withdrawn.

III.   Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2006   By: /Kirk J. DeNiro/
                                                       Kirk J. DeNiro
                                                       Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665

- 9 -